



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/929,272	08/14/2001	Thomas J. Perkowski	100-002USANB0	8374
7590	04/06/2006		EXAMINER	
Thomas J. Perkowski, Esq., P.C. Soundview Plaza 1266 East Main Street Stamford, CT 06902			ALLEN, WILLIAM J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3625	

DATE MAILED: 04/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/929,272	PERKOWSKI, THOMAS J.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	William J. Allen	3625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 February 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 18-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 18-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 January 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Prosecution History

Claims 1-44 were restricted.

Claims 1-17 and 25-44 have been canceled per Applicant's amendment filed 1/30/2002.

Claims 18-24 are pending in the application.

The Examiner additionally notes that in view of the preliminary amendment filed 1/30/2002, the Election/Restriction requirement for claims 1-44 has been withdrawn and claims 18-24 will be examined on the merits.

Specification

The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. **Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

Claim 21 recites the limitation "wherein service related information is of a *multi media nature*". The Examiner cites paragraphs 6, 11, 31, 54, 59 and 127 of the instant applications as being relevant to *multi-media information*; however, these paragraphs (as well as the remainder of the specification) do not supply an adequate definition of information of a *multi-media nature*. For examination purposes, information of a *multi-media nature* will include textual, graphical, and other relevant product/service information received via a means such as a Web Page or the like.

3. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 24 recites the limitation "UPN" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The Examiner will interpret "UPN" to be "USN" as recited in claim 22.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 18-20 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kirsch (US 5,963,915) in view of Sandifer (US 6,292,806).

Regarding claim 22, Kirsch teaches the following:

(a) *storing in a database server connected to the Internet, information representative of (i) a plurality of universal service identifiers assigned to a plurality of services and (ii) a plurality of URLs symbolically linked to said plurality of US identifiers, each said URL specifying the location of an information resource located on the Internet related to a particular one of said services* (see at least: Fig. 1, Fig. 2, col. 4 lines 48-64).

(b) *storing in a plurality of service-information servers, information related to said plurality of services* (see at least: Fig. 2, col. 4 lines 48-64, col. 10 lines 15-30);

(c) *transmitting to said database server from said client system, a request for information about one of said plurality of services located on the internet, wherein the request includes information representative of the USN assigned to said service* (see at least: abstract, col. 10 lines 15-30, col. 4 lines 48-64). The Examiner notes that the merchant server receives the URL via a customer request on the browser. Therein, the service identifier is derived and recorded from the predetermined URL. By providing a request using the URLs, the customer is thereby providing *information representative of the USN*;

(d) *at least one said service information server responding to said request transmitted to said database server, and delivering to said client system, information related to one of said plurality of services specified by the URL symbolically linked to the USN and included in said request* (see at least: col. 10 lines 15-30).

Kirsch teaches all of the above and further teaches universal product and service identifiers linked to URLs (see at least: col. 4 lines 48-64). Kirsch, however, does not expressly teach where the universal service identifiers are *numbers*. Sandifer teaches searching and identifying parts by indicating a specific *number* to identify the part (see at least: col. 2 line 65 to col. 3 line 2, Fig. 28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified the invention of Kirsch to include *numbers* as the unique identifiers as taught by Sandifer in order to provide an easy means to search for and select part/products from illustrated catalogs from which a purchase order can be created (see at least: Sandifer, col. 2 line 65 to col. 3 line 2, col. 4 lines 16-18 and 23-26).

Regarding claim 23, Kirsch further teaches *wherein said US identifier assigned to each service is a unique service code assigned to said service* (see at least: abstract). The Examiner notes that a predetermined URL references a single product, which encodes the identifier of the purchasable product. Kirsch, however, does not expressly show where the identifier/code is a *number*. Sandifer teaches searching and identifying parts by indicating a specific *number* to identify the part (see at least: col. 2 line 65 to col. 3 line 2, col. 4 lines 16-26, Fig. 28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified the invention of Kirsch to include *numbers* as the unique identifiers as taught by Sandifer in order to provide an easy means to search for and select part/products from illustrated catalogs from which a

purchase order can be created (see at least: Sandifer, col. 2 line 65 to col. 3 line 2, col. 4 lines 16-18 and 23-26).

Regarding claim 24, Kirsch teaches all of the above but does not expressly teach *wherein step (c) comprises: selecting a on-screen service finder button displayed by an Internet browser program running on said client system, whereupon a dialogue box is displayed requesting that the UPN associated with the requested service be entered; and entering said UPN into said dialogue box*. Sandifer teaches *wherein step (c) comprises: selecting a on-screen service finder button displayed by an Internet browser program running on said client system, whereupon a dialogue box is displayed requesting that the UPN associated with the requested service be entered; and entering said UPN into said dialogue box* (see at least: col. 2 line 65 to col. 3 line 2, col. 4 lines 16-26, col. 6 lines 5-54, Fig. 28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified the invention of Kirsch to include *wherein step (c) comprises: selecting a on-screen service finder button displayed by an Internet browser program running on said client system, whereupon a dialogue box is displayed requesting that the UPN associated with the requested service be entered; and entering said UPN into said dialogue box* as taught by Sandifer in order to provide an easy means to search for and select part/products from illustrated catalogs from which a purchase order can be created (see at least: Sandifer, col. 2 line 65 to col. 3 line 2, col. 4 lines 16-18 and 23-26).

Regarding claims 18-20, the limitations set forth in claims 18-20 closely parallel the limitations set forth in claims 22-24. Claims 18-20 are thereby rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 21, Kirsch further teaches *wherein the service related information is of a multi-media nature* (see at least: col. 6 lines 14-20).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William J. Allen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1443. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Fadok can be reached on (571) 272-6755. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

William J. Allen
Patent Examiner
March 31, 2006

WJAL SP 3625
ART NO 2 FADOK
MAR 31 2006